REMARKS

Claims 1-33 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 17, 25-29, and 32 are amended in this Response.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1, 9, 17, 25-29, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25-29 have each been amended in a manner believed to resolve the insufficient antecedent basis for the element "network." Claim 32 has been amended in a manner believed to resolve the insufficient antecedent basis for the element "time information."

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-27 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cuomo, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,614).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is amended to further clarify that the first application resides on the client. The first application is utilized to collect information from the second application. Simply nowhere in Cuomo is such a first application that resides on a client (as recited in amended claim 1) disclosed, taught, or suggested. In contrast, the monitoring of the monitoring and collection of information performed in Cuomo is accomplished utilizing an Access Information Collector 240 that resides on the *server side* of the network rather than on the client side as clearly depicted in Figure 2 of Cuomo and col. 4, lines 5-20. Cuomo further states that "a method is needed for... collecting user access information... at a Web server..." (see col. 1, line 67 – col. 2, line 3). This quote clearly indicates the purpose of Cuomo is to provide a method to collect information about a client from the server side and *not* from the client side in the manner recited in amended claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1, as amended, cannot be anticipated by Cuomo.

Amended claim 1 also recites that the first application store at least a portion of the collected information on the client. However, in Cuomo, there is simply no teaching, disclosure or suggestion that the information collected by the Access Information Collector 240 is stored in a

client 200. As a result, for at least this reason or in addition to the previously discussed reason, amended claim 1 cannot be anticipated by Cuomo.

Claims 9, 17, and 25 have each been amended in a manner similar to amended claim 1. Therefore, for the same reasons as discussed above for amended claim 1, claims 9, 17 and 25 as amended, are each believed to be allowable over Cuomo.

Claim 26 is amended to further clarify that the first application resides on the client. The first application is utilized to collect information from the second application. The first application also stores at least a portion of the collected information on the client. For the reasons similar to those previously discussed with respect to amended claim 1, there is no teaching, disclosure or suggestion in Cuomo of such a first application. In addition, claim 26 requires that information relating to the collected information be transmitted to a location utilizing a network. Since there is no collecting of information at the client side in Cuomo, this step is also not taught, disclosed or suggest in Cuomo. Based on these reasons, therefore, claim 26, as amended, is not anticipated by Cuomo.

Claims 27, 28, and 29, as amended, are each believed to be allowable over Cuomo, for at least the reasons set forth above for amended claim 26.

Claims 2-8 and 30-32 depend from amended claim 1. Claims 10-16 depend from amended claim 9. Claims 18-24 depend from amended claim 17. Claim 33 depends from amended claim 28. At least by virtue of their respective dependencies, claims 2-8, 10-16, 18-24, and 30-33 are believed to allowable over Cuomo and, therefore, in condition for allowance.

For these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 28 and 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cuomo in view of Official Notice.

This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons previously set forth above.

In addition, the Examiner statement that "the use of browser monitoring software is well know and would obvious[ly] form a more effective means of monitoring network usage of web related sites..." (emphasis added) is insufficient to establish a basis for Office Notice. Knowledge of the present use of browser monitoring software cannot be applied to applications filed in the past. It is respectfully requested that evidence of prior art browser monitoring software capable of performing all of the limitations of claims 30-33 be provided and that a motivation to combine such prior art browser monitoring software with Cuomo by one of ordinary skill in the art be established.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 843-3215.

In addition, if for any reason an insufficient fee has been paid, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge the insufficiency to Deposit Account No. **05-0150**.

Date: June 3, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Vidya R. Bhakar
Registration No. 42,323

Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

PaloAlto/68775.1